

Minnesota Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98.0%. The FFY 2006 data were 98.8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 12 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2006 with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1) were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that is in compliance with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has initiated services for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of infants and toddlers</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 93.8%. These data</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to</p>

Minnesota Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children. [Results Indicator]	represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 92.3%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 91%.	improve performance.																												
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	<div>The State’s FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</div> <table><tr><th>07-08 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data</th><th>Social Emotional</th><th>Knowledge & Skills</th><th>Appropriate Behavior</th></tr><tr><td>a. % of infants & toddlers who did not improve functioning.</td><td>2.55</td><td>1.79</td><td>2.36</td></tr><tr><td>b. % of infants & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td><td>29.18</td><td>29.46</td><td>24.55</td></tr><tr><td>c. % of infants & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td><td>33.90</td><td>34.94</td><td>30.78</td></tr><tr><td>d. % of infants & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td><td>17.94</td><td>19.83</td><td>20.77</td></tr><tr><td>e. % of infants & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td><td>16.43</td><td>13.98</td><td>21.53</td></tr><tr><td>Total (approx. 100%)</td><td>100.00 %</td><td>100.00 %</td><td>99.99%</td></tr></table>	07-08 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of infants & toddlers who did not improve functioning.	2.55	1.79	2.36	b. % of infants & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	29.18	29.46	24.55	c. % of infants & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	33.90	34.94	30.78	d. % of infants & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	17.94	19.83	20.77	e. % of infants & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	16.43	13.98	21.53	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	99.99%	The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
07-08 Infant and Toddler Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																											
a. % of infants & toddlers who did not improve functioning.	2.55	1.79	2.36																											
b. % of infants & toddlers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	29.18	29.46	24.55																											
c. % of infants & toddlers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	33.90	34.94	30.78																											
d. % of infants & toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	17.94	19.83	20.77																											
e. % of infants & toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	16.43	13.98	21.53																											
Total (approx. 100%)	100.00 %	100.00 %	99.99%																											

Minnesota Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p> <p>A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and C. Help their children develop and learn.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>FFY 2006 Data</td><td>FFY 2007 Data</td><td>FFY 2007 Target</td><td>Progress</td></tr><tr><td>A. Know their rights. (%)</td><td>75</td><td>76.6</td><td>80</td><td>1.60%</td></tr><tr><td>B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs. (%)</td><td>87</td><td>83.1</td><td>84</td><td>-3.90%</td></tr><tr><td>C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)</td><td>90</td><td>86.7</td><td>90</td><td>-3.30%</td></tr></table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. Know their rights. (%)	75	76.6	80	1.60%	B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs. (%)	87	83.1	84	-3.90%	C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)	90	86.7	90	-3.30%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. Know their rights. (%)	75	76.6	80	1.60%																		
B. Effectively communicate their children’s needs. (%)	87	83.1	84	-3.90%																		
C. Help their children develop and learn. (%)	90	86.7	90	-3.30%																		
<p>5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and B. National data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0.62%. The FFY 2006 data were 0.63%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0.60%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>																				
<p>6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:</p> <p>A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and B. National data.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.83%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 1.70%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 1.90%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>																				
<p>7. Percent of eligible infants and</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance</p>																				

Minnesota Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 83.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 86.3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all eight findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>findings identified in FFY 2006 with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a), including correction of noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 91%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 87%.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §§303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h), including</p>

Minnesota Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator in FFY 2006, the State reported that it made no FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance related to this indicator.</p>	<p>correction of noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1).</p>
<p>8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 59%. These data are not comparable to previous years. Beginning in FFY 2007, the State's data for</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2006 with the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified</p>

Minnesota Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>this indicator included only those children exiting Part C and who were potentially eligible for Part B. During the two prior reporting years, the State reported on transition conferences for all children who exited Part C.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all eight findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) were corrected.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the timely transition conference requirements, including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has conducted a transition conference for each child potentially eligible for Part B, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP 09-02 Memo.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>9. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from 96.6%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 126 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting all noncompliance findings identified by the State in FFY 2006, in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A) and 34 CFR §303.501.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance reported under Indicators 1, 7, 8A, and 8C in the FFY 2007 APR, the</p>

Minnesota Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each EIS program with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.</p>
<p>10. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that it did not receive any signed written complaints during the FFY 2007 reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that it did not receive any due process hearing requests during the FFY 2007 reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that no resolution sessions were held during the FFY 2007 reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>

Minnesota Part C FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported that no mediations were held during the FFY 2007 reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618, and 642, and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.</p>